CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

PRISM

AN ANGLICAN MONTHLY

AUGUST 1960 Vol. IV No. 4

CATHOLIC, PROTESTANT, CHRISTIAN

1s. 6d.

PRISM
NEEDS
REGULAR
SUBSCRIBERS

Editors
ROBIN DENNISTON
CHRISTOPHER MARTIN

Business Manager
ROBIN MINNEY

All subscriptions, cheques, articles and correspondence to :—
PRISM, 7, Tufton Street, London, S.W.1
Telephone : ABBey 3760

Subscription rates *(post free)* :
3 months, 5s.
6 months, 10s.
12 months, 20s.
Prism can also be obtained at Church bookshops

THIS MONTH

		Page
FOCUS		1
ON BEING NO-CHURCH	George Austin	2
AN INQUISITION OF PAPALISM	John Wilkinson	4
ON BEING LOW CHURCH	Peter Morgan	14
UNITY IN THE TRUTH: A POEM	E. L. Mascall	17
COMMENT		18
DOWN PROTESTANT HACKLES	William Bush	25
BUT WE ARE PROTESTANTS!	George Every, S.S.M.	29
REPORT OF KEBLE CONFERENCE		32
LETTERS		35
BOOKS		39

The Population Explosion and Christian Responsibility by Richard M. Fagley
The Making of the Church by J. G. Davies

Focus

This number of *Prism* happened by accident. We were planning a light and amusing number to be read on mediterranean beaches or surreptitiously in the conference rooms of summer schools. It then dawned on us that several contributors seemed to be going on about the same thing. That thing is commonly, and rather depressingly, called ecumenism.

Now the ecumenical movement is of the utmost importance, but writing about it tends to be so full of highflown protestations of partnership with the Holy Ghost that most sinners cannot bear to read it. It is not unsignificant that the class of religious book labelled "unity" or "ecumenical" is the slowest seller in the shop, and check with your local S.P.C.K. branch if you don't believe this. So we are not calling this an ecumenical number for we know that nobody would read it. But what ecumenism is in a world-wide context, churchmanship is in the narrowly English anglicanism in which many of us find ourselves. And though most of us are tired and exasperated by the infantile wranglings of party churchmen, churchmanship nonetheless is a rivetting subject and, shorn of its lunatic fringes, of the greatest theological importance. And so in the pages that follow we have views on Anglican Papalism, the rehabilitation of the word "protestant", the propriety for protestants of the adjuncts of Catholic worship, and so on. Even Dr. Mascall is inspired to break into song by an ecumenical conference. We have had to hold over till next time, amongst many other wonderful articles, an important counter-attack to G. C. Darton's remarks on Stewardship (our July number) and a consideration of the issues raised by Bernard Williams (June *Prism*).

Prism itself has always been implicitly high church; we believe in the whole catholic faith and not in diffused Christianity, and it is only from this presupposition that we think reforms and experiments are justified. The fact that we have been able to go on is an indication that other people, our readers in fact, share this point of view. In the future, under changed ownership, we hope to continue in the same vein so long as there are people who have things they want to say. Our new owner is Timothy Beaumont, recently a vicar in Hong Kong, born, as he says, of rich but honest parents, and now the proprietor of *Time and Tide*. In October of this year he will become *Prism's* editor. His greater resources will bring in a wider variety of talent than our previous finances have permitted. A small magazine like ours inevitably reflects very closely the particular concerns of its editor; in this case we think the concerns of the present editorial setup and the future one are so similar that, whether they like it or not, readers will hardly notice the difference.

On Being No-Church

George Austin

An article in a recent issue of *Prism* in which the writer considered the Church of England from what he described as his "Roman eyrie" somewhere on the Continent ("On Being High Church" by Maximus Ironmaster, April issue) has prompted me to look up, around and down from my own eyrie perched fairly near to the top of the Anglican mountain.

I sometimes visit my neighbours who live right at the summit, and what an odd crowd they are! Their nests are flimsy affairs which need rebuilding with every ultra-montane wind of change that blows from the nearby Roman mountain. They wear exotic plumage and often like to sing in a strange tongue, while some are only prevented from taking wing and flying across to join their near-neighbours by family considerations (and they sometimes have large families, since——oh! but that's another story). In many ways it is a delightful position. They can see what They are doing on Their mountain, yet cannot see down the slopes of their own.

From my eyrie, however, I can see right to the foot of the mountain, beyond the broad, wide slopes where curious creatures live in dens and caves of the earth, down and down to the foothills where live black and hooded birds, hybrids who flirt and mate with strange fowl who dwell on mountains made by man.

But enough of this nonsense! Personally, I am sick to death of High Church, Low Church, Broad Church, Central Church, Modern Church, Prayer Book Catholic, Conservative Evangelical, Liberal Evangelical (Socialist . . .?), Catholics, Protestants and all the rest who make up the odd children of the Mother-of-us-All. How much indeed do we know about each other? Or, worse still, want to know? But we do have caricatures of each other.

The Reverend J. William Black-Prott knows that Father Manfred Spyke, O.A.P., is a man to be feared, a jesuitical wolf in a calvinistic sheep-fold. All Catholics belong to guilds and orders and confraternities whose exotic names faintly resemble their Roman counterparts, and Fr. Spyke is no exception. The Order for the Adoration of Priestcraft is specifically aimed at the destruction of what the Rev. Mr. Black-Prott believes to be our precious reformation heritage. Fr. Spyke has no use for the C. of E. and as he walks through his parish in his soutane and curé hat, he recites the Rosary

with special intention for the Conversion of England and Confounding of Mr. Black-Prott.

For Father Manfred Spyke, O.A.P., knows that the Reverend J. William Black-Prott is a man to be feared, a zwinglian lion in a den of catholic foundlings. Protestants do not say their offices and even though Fr. Spyke only uses the Breviary he does feel that Mattins and Evensong would be better than nothing. Indeed, since Mr. Black-Prott's church is locked from Sunday to Sunday, it is unlikely that he ever says his prayers or meditates upon the Sorrowful Mysteries. He holds United Services and even has Dissenting Ministers to preach to his utterly uninstructed congregation; he is Against Drink, Dancing and the Cinema; and as he walks through his parish, stroking his moustache, he longs for the day when the C. of E. will disappear in that pan-protestant deluge known as the Coming Great Church.

Those at the extremities of the Church of England do paint these curious images of each other, but how far are they false pictures? We must admit that a small number of clergymen fit the caricatures. There are Catholic Societies which appear to bear more allegiance to the Church of Rome than to the Church of England; and there are Protestants who are considerably less loyal to the Book of Common Prayer than are their Catholic counterparts. Yet on the whole, these pictures are becoming more and more out-of-date, and indeed because of this, Maximus Ironmaster's own view of the Church of England is in a curious way, if not equally out-of-date, certainly rather irrelevant.

High and crazy, Broad and hazy, Low and lazy—these are tags which may still be hung on the cloud-shrouded heads of some of our brethren, but on the whole, High and Low at any rate have never been closer. We do not always use the same words and we shudder at some of the phrases used by our opposite numbers. I dislike the sort of extempore prayer which tells the Lord to DO this and DO that, and the constant talk of "taking the Lord Jesus into your heart" and "being saved" falls ill on Catholic ears. But is it not at bottom essentially the same as what a Catholic would mean by devotion to our Lord?

I recently paid a visit to the Rev. David Shepherd's Mayflower Settlement in a tough area of London's dockland. I must admit that I did not like the suggestion on the notice-board that All Are Welcome to Holy Communion (how do Evangelicals explain away the fact that Anglicans must be confirmed but Nonconformists need not be?) nor did I find the bareness of the chapel to my taste. But that faded into insignificance beside the overwhelming impression that someone had brought Christ, His claims and His Person, to

a crowd of young people who were of that type of tough, friendly, London teenager normally associated with a complete lack of any religious appreciation whatsoever. It was far from being "cricket religion" and there was no Rock 'n' Roll; it would make any but the most stupidly prejudiced Anglo-Papalist think hard before he dared pour scorn on an Evangelical.

Again, only the most stupidly prejudiced Protestant would suggest that Catholics have no interest in the preaching of the Word in face of the increasing awareness in Catholic circles of the indivisibility of the Ministry of the Word and the Ministry of the Sacrament. (I wonder if there is any truth in the rumour that some French churches now have a white light before the open Bible as well as before the Blessed Sacrament, because both tabernacle and Bible contain the Word of God.)

Of course eccentric Catholic parishes and societies, in ungodly concord with the Protestant Truth Society, will continue to fight the battles of yesterday and give the deChristianised world the impression that the Church is fiddling, not while Rome burns, but while millions rot in refugee camps, while millions more face near-slavery in Commonwealth police states, and while the whole world risks total annihilation if some fool misreads a radar screen and presses a button.

One of the few hopeful signs in the Church of England today is that Catholic Evangelicals and Evangelical Catholics have discovered each other and have begun to face up to the problems that should really matter to a Christian. And if some of them must add to the difficulties of celebrating in a surplice and stole by standing in that extraordinary position at the north end of the Lord's Table, will it further the Kingdom of God one jot if we try to stop them?

An Inquisition of Papalism

John Wilkinson

"Certainly the Church is visible", said Father Victor White in a celebrated article, "and visible by reason of the visibility of her members and her organisation. But the edges are very blurred". No edges are harder to define than those between an offshoot and its

parent body : and there are thus many doctrines which it is possible for Anglicans to share directly with Roman Catholics.

From this possibility of discovering common values in the two communities, we may look for some deeper union both for the problematic future and for the present. And it seems that this union is already in existence, for, as the Council of Florence put it, "By Baptism we are made members of Christ and of the Body of the Church". We are thus united with all men in a religious bond by Creation : and united in the mystical Body of Christ by Baptism.

This union, however, important though it is, is not practically accepted yet by Christians as the means of breaking down the walls of partition between one visible society of Christians and another. Though there are many who hope that this division of Christians can be brought to an end, and the unity of heaven reflected by the single Church of God on earth, different societies of Christians have developed their own insights of the Christian life with God in ways which have proved so far mutually exclusive. So Creation and Baptism remain the foundations of the state in which man achieves perfection of love in society : but the sin and ignorance of man have frustrated them, and both international and ecumenical life is lived in communities which are partial and await re-integration.

Among these societies of Christians the Roman Church stands out as playing, from the first, a leading rôle in the developing religion of Christ. Because she claims that she has kept safe the tradition of Christ and the apostles, she regards those who diverge from her own tradition as running a risk. She does not claim that at any given moment she knows all the truth, or expresses it adequately in her teaching : she even recognises that there may be those outside the Roman obedience who are at the present moment emphasising parts of the truth more fully than herself. But despite this possibility, she cannot admit that any Christian society is fully a Church unless she overtly shares in the Roman tradition ; which she is bound to do so long as she identifies her tradition with that of Christ.

Thus there are certain marks which will distinguish a church which a Roman Catholic may recognise as part of the one Church : in its traditions we shall find a constant adherence to the authority of the Holy Scriptures, and a faithful administration of the sacraments according to the will of Christ, so far the very marks defined by Article XIX :

> "The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly administered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same."

Moreover it is no coincidence that the marks of a Church as defined in the Articles of the Church of England should be marks which in themselves would be acceptable to the Roman Church: for it is the contention of Anglicans that they too are faithful to the tradition handed down from Jesus Christ by his apostles, and their duly constituted successors, the bishops of the Church, and thus members of "the One Holy Catholick and Apostolick Church" of which Christians spoke before divisions had become widespread. The Church of England does not, however, regard herself (as the Donatists did) as the only true Church: rather she admits that she is a "particular or national Church" (Art. XXXIV), and that "in the visible Church the evil (is) ever mingled with the good" (Art. XXVI).

The only justification for this conception of national parts of the One Church, an thus for the existence of the Anglican Church as a true Church is that expressed in the second half of Article XIX :—

> "As the Church of *Jerusalem*, *Alexandria*, and *Antioch* have erred; so also the Church of *Rome* hath erred, not only in their living and manner of Ceremonies, but also in matters of Faith."

According to the Anglican view the Church is visibly one, because in each nation or part we find Christians organised in visible societies which can be seen to be faithful to the tradition of the apostles. But all these parts are capable of error, and there is evidence that in fact they have erred. Indeed one might go further, and say that the national or particular Church of England is, as such, liable to error.

Thus at the Reformation the Church of England gave concrete expression to its awareness of errors in the Church, and took particular pains to point out that these errors applied to the Church of Rome as well as to other Churches. Among the Roman errors which they were concerned to reject was the claim of the Roman Bishop to universal jurisdiction: and they roundly state that "The Bishop of *Rome* hath no jurisdiction in this realm of *England*" (Art. XXXVII).

This new ecclesiology ran counter to the current teaching of Rome, and brought about a change in vocabulary which has had far-reaching consequences. We can see the results today in the Anglican uses of the words "Catholic", "Authority", and "Re-union", to mention only three. But the Anglicans did not think that they were expressing new beliefs. Their claim rested on the assumption that they were expressing the beliefs of the true Christian tradition in new forms of words. Often they found this attempt led them into difficulties, and the resultant doctrines and their expression were on occasion perhaps dangerously vague, though it must also be said

that sometimes the re-statement of an old belief revealed a weakness in its previous formulation. But the repudiation of the authority of the Pope was not among the doctrines which were expressed in a vague form, and if a commentary is required on the mind of the framers of the Articles, it is supplied in the Edwardine Ordinal of 1550 in which the Bishop :

> "shall cause the Oath of the King's Supremacy and against the usurped power of the bishop of Rome to be ministered unto every one of them that are to be ordered."

And this was the oath :—

> "I from henceforth shall utterly renounce, refute, relinquish, and forsake the bishop of Rome, and his authority, power, and jurisdiction. And I shall never consent nor agree that the bishop of Rome shall practise, exercise, or have any manner of authority, jurisdiction, or power within this realm or any other of the King's dominions, but shall resist the same at all times to the uttermost of my power."

Thus, though this oath is now in disuse, the repudiation it implies remains a part of the Anglican system. Every man that is to be ordained must assent to the Thirty-Nine Articles, and we have already seen that Article XIX excludes the authority of Rome in more than one place. Moreover the Ordinal not only omits any reference to Rome, but in its first question to the candidate demands :

> "Do you think in your heart that you be truly called, according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the order of this Church of *England*, to the Order and Ministry of Priesthood?
>
> *Answer.* I think it."

It would thus appear that all ordained members of the Church of England have, to say the least of it, received their orders in a Church which they formally recognise to be outside the jurisdiction of the "bishop of Rome". And laity who accept their ministrations by implication accept also the validity of sacraments administered in such a Church.

Despite this explicit repudiation of Roman claims there were, even in the seventeenth century, Anglicans who "did not regard these formulas as inconsistent with recognition of the Pope as head of the Church" (Jalland), among whom we may point to King James I, and Bramhall, who was perhaps the more reliable theologian of the two.

"Nevertheless", says Jalland, "one must admit that without some positive act of repudiation, the Church of England remains in some sense committed to her own past."

And there are Anglicans today who feel free to see in the Pope the head of the Church, to such an extent that they allow him both the power to define doctrine with infallibility, and look to him for the authority of their priestly acts.

While there are some such Papalist Anglicans who accept in a very strong sense indeed the definition of Papal infallibility as expressed in the Constitution *Pastor Aeternus* of the Vatican Council, they usually do so because they have not given sufficient thought to the study of the limiting phrases it contains.

Even however on a minimal view of the Roman dogma, the ideas of infallibility and of the Pope's supreme jurisdiction remain. Let us therefore suppose that, as an Anglican, I accept this minimal view.

The first result will be that, as the Pope is the pastor and teacher of all Christians, by my Baptism I was submitted to Roman doctrine and jurisdiction. I thus accept the Roman Church as the authoritative source of true teaching, and owe my obedience first and foremost to this authority, for in the communion of the Pope alone am I sure to find the truth.

This is a further motive for my desire to see the schism, which evidently prevents most Anglicans from accepting the Pope's teaching, ended. And I shall feel it my duty not merely to work for the acceptance of Roman teaching myself, but to encourage all other Anglicans to understand the necessity of accepting it now. This duty is, moreover, unaffected by my possible dislike of the forms in which Rome presents the truth, or the consideration that at this moment it is not practicable as providing the means of salvation for those in my care.

Thirty years ago I should have felt it also my duty as a Papalist to express my conviction by an exterior conformity to the liturgical formulae of the Western Church, thereby showing that as a member of the Church Catholic in England, I was not separated from the life and development of the Roman Communion. But that time is rapidly passing, and today those Anglicans who acknowledge the Pope as supreme Head of the Church very often regard "the Western Rite"—especially when this means a mixture of the Roman Mass and the Prayer Book—as, to say the least of it, something which falls outside the scope of infallibility. The next few years will probably show that more and more Anglicans will come to see this spurious liturgical obedience to the Roman decrees as

something naive (because the Prayer Book is in many ways still well ahead of the Missal and Breviary) and out of date (because it belonged to the days when it was part of the battle—now won by the Anglo-Catholics—for the recognition of the sacramental life).

Liturgical questions are one thing, but, for the Anglican Papalist the doctrinal question is very much another. The dogmas of the Assumption of the B.V.M., and her Immaculate Conception are not things which I am at liberty to dismiss as out of date or naive. Not only am I bound, as a Papalist, to accept them myself: I am also bound, because these two doctrines are a necessary part of the saving Christian teaching, to teach them to all in my care.

The more I teach these doctrines, the more work I feel I am doing for Christian Unity, for I am faithfully preparing for the day when, in God's good time, the Church of England returns to full communion with the remainder of the Catholic Church in the West. And surely this is not prejudging too rashly the general pattern of the reunion between the Anglican and Roman Communions, for the Anglicans came into existence by a schism from the Roman Communion, and their act of reunion can be thought of by all as a return.

But the Anglican Papalist cannot remain in this doctrinal position: for one thing he wants to believe something against which he has formally given his word, and for another he finds himself in the position where he feels it his duty, if he is ordained, to exercise the authority committed to him to teach doctrines which are contrary to that authority in its official expressions.

There are many Papalists who try to base their intellectual integrity on the nature of their subscription to the Thirty-Nine Articles. They plead that the days are now past when they were required to declare that:

> "I . . . . do willingly and from my heart subscribe to the 39 Articles of Religion of the United Church of England and Ireland . . . and to all things therein contained."

And they point to the deliberate change by which candidates for ordination and for institution to a benefice were given the less comprehensive form of declaration:

> "I . . . do solemnly make the following declaration, I assent to the 39 Articles of Religion and the Book of Common Prayer and of ordering of Bishops Priests and Deacons. I believe the doctrine of the Church of England therein set forth to be agreeable to the word of God and in public prayer and administration of the Sacraments I will use the form in the said book prescribed and none other, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority."

Those offering themselves to serve, called, as they think, according to the will of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the order of this Church of England, as Bishops Priests or Deacons are not required positively to applaud every detail of the Thirty-Nine Articles. But this is not the equivalent of complete freedom to accept or reject any or all of them at will. It is noticeable that the two parts of the declaration are distinct, though they deal with related matter: and the second part of the declaration is more positive than the first. So:

a. The assent is general; and there may be reservations over certain details in the Articles, the Prayer Book, or the Ordinal. But having expressed a general assent, it is presumed that the maker of the declaration is aware of the general trend, and of the main doctrines of the Articles, and holds a position sufficiently close to the one they partially define to be able solemnly to declare in the presence of witnesses that he assents to them, and to the other formularies named. To assent to something is not to hail it as perfect: but it is to accept something as authoritative.

b. The Declaration of Belief in the second half states that the Articles, the Prayer Book and the Ordinal "set forth" the doctrine, or at least part of the doctrine of the Church of England, and that this part of the doctrine is believed by the maker of the declaration to be agreeable to the Word of God. He then declares his intention to use the form in the said book prescribed, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority.

But as we have seen, at least three of the Articles assume an ecclesiology which excludes the power of the Pope both in the sense in which it was generally held in the Western Church at the time of the Reformation, and also in the sense defined in *Pastor Aeternus*. It can hardly be held that the nature of assent to the Articles is so general that it can be assumed to neglect what is so basic a part of the Articles. The assent to the Articles is therefore tantamount to dissent from the authority of the Pope, and this is obvious when we consider the reactions of a Roman asked to assent to the Articles. Of course he would have to refuse, if he were required to make the declaration in good faith.

Two things further may be noticed: first, by stating a belief in the doctrine set forth in the Anglican formularies as being consistent with Scripture, we implicitly deny the legitimate application of the Scripture as an argument for the authority of the Papacy, and secondly, by accepting the ordinal after the Bull *Apostolicae Curae* we are acting in opposition to the Roman pronouncement about that ordinal, and are therefore at least deliberately choosing to accept a

ministry (and perhaps to exercise it) which has been stated on Roman authority to be of very doubtful status.

As a Papalist, I may still feel that I am making a sacrifice which is, in the interests of Unity, worth the effort. So I may see my position as follows : I accept that the Pope is the appointed means of expressing to all the Church doctrines concerning faith and morals ; but I am committed to teaching the truth, and to leading my people and my Anglican neighbours towards the attainment of the fuller truth which Christians will find in an undivided Church. My duty is therefore to accept my difficult position, and hasten, so far as I can, the return of the Anglican Church to the mother Church of the West.

From a Roman point of view this position might conceivably seem to be well oriented. Unity is of great importance, but the importance of truth is supreme. Let us ask, then, what the truth is. It is clear from the outset that, whether I am a Roman or an Anglican I am committed to a religious society which is in some sense or other incomplete. If I am a Roman, I can give no clear-cut definition of the status of the Eastern Orthodox churches, for from some points of view I recognise them as true parts of the one church, and from others as separated. And if I am an Anglican I make no claim to be a member of the only true form of Christian Church, and readily admit the existence of other true parts of the Catholic Church, and the fact that I am in disagreement with each of them in one way or another.

But, as an Anglican, I commit myself to the Church of England in the belief that, despite its imperfections, it offers me a Church in which I am confident of finding a teaching and life sufficiently complete to provide the means of grace and salvation. My act of committal is like the sacrament of marriage in one respect. For, at least in theory, I make a choice between alternatives : I might marry Mary or Jane or Elizabeth, I might become an Anglican or a Baptist or a Roman Catholic. But when I choose one, I do not necessarily condemn the others. I may still appreciate and praise their excellent qualities, but I cannot share them, for I commit myself exclusively to one. Only through one wife can I find the perfection of married love. Only through complete committal to one Church, in the full knowledge that it will prove imperfect, can I find the perfection of Christian love. And any flirting or adultery will have the necessary result that it makes the perfection of married love harder to attain, just as it will cloud my appreciation of the essence of love which I am trying in my marriage to show forth.

As with all analogies, there comes a point where the similarity ceases. The solemn vows of religious commitment and matrimony are each unconditional. But whereas divorce is not possible in marriage, in our religious allegiance we are always at liberty to

substitute for the promises once made in ignorance, new promises which we regard as consistent with our changing view of truth.

So, in choosing to become, or remain an Anglican, I am consciously committing myself to a system which depends for its existence on the denial of infallibility, and I cannot accept the Papalist position and at the same time remain an Anglican without "double-think". This conclusion is only inescapable because *Pastor Aeternus*, even on a minimal interpretation, is an absolute claim. Unlike many other Christian teachings, it must receive the answer "Yes, I accept", or "No, I do not accept", and there is no half-way house, no golden, nor even Anglican mean.

Despite all its limiting phraseology, the meaning of *Pastor Aeternus* is perfectly definite. Certainly there are points of doubt, and large questions which have to be answered before we come to any instance where we can say with confidence that, according to *Pastor Aeternus*, *this* decision is irreformable. I cannot respond to such a dogma with the "Well, yes and no" which I might offer when confronted with some subtle point of Christology or the doctrine of the Eucharist. Either something is irreformable or not. And if irreformable, then permanently right or permanently wrong. And if permanently right, and, as *Pastor Aeternus* gives us to understand, right by the divine infallibility, then universally binding.

The whole emphasis of the Anglican formularies was directed against the kind of theological statement which says that "The Holy Spirit (infallibly) must (infallibly) work under certain human conditions". The articles say that even General Councils may err. Thus, despite my efforts, I cannot remain an Anglican Papalist without being both logically self-contradictory, and unfaithful to my ordination oath.

Because the claim of the Papacy is absolute, it demands absolute obedience and acceptance. If I accept the claim, and am an ordained minister of the Church of England, I must realise, sooner or later, that in the eyes of the authority I recognise it is not Holy Communion which I administer to my flock, and that it is no true Bishop who came last week to administer Confirmation to the children I prepared, and seven years ago laid his hands on my head in the mistaken belief that he was ordaining me to the apostolic ministry of the Church of God. If the people in my pastoral care come to me needing the means of grace, I can give them no assured absolution in their sorrow nor sacrifice for their joy. Is this the kind of price which will pay for Unity? Surely it is the result of something far less important and laudable.

If therefore we choose rather to say that the Anglican Papalist

must renounce either his belief in Papal infallibility or his allegiance to the Church of England, does this mean that there are some Anglicans now who ought not to delay to become Roman Catholics? Certainly it does, and many Anglicans will agree. Certainly it does, say the Romans who are more interested in quantity than quality. But who is to deny that the men who have been capable of being Papalist Anglicans will not be as content to be un-papalist Roman Catholics? *Caveat emptor.*

But in the wider problem of Reunion the position of converts is crucial. For if I renounce my obedience as an Anglican, and become a Roman, am I committing myself to a categoric denial of all good in the Anglican Church? The answer to this question would certainly be no. For though Romans claim that within the Church, that is to say the Churches in communion with the Roman See, one can be sure that the Holy Spirit is at work in the appointed means of grace, no Roman would limit the work of the Holy Spirit to the limits of his own Communion. And similarly, if I renounce my Papalism and remain an Anglican, I need not thereby renounce my love and admiration for the Roman Church: for from the first the Church of England has admitted the Church of Rome to be a veritable part of the Catholic Church, though an erring one.

Nor, if I remain an Anglican, need I renounce my hopes for ultimate unity with the Pope. For history shows that under ideal conditions he has been the chief Patriarch of the Church, and if the Church of England acknowledged his supremacy in this capacity, and submitted once more to his leadership by returning to her place as a part of the Western Church, this would be at least one step nearer Unity.

The question of infallibility in a re-united Church would, again, have to be reconsidered. The Church of England makes no statement which would rule out her acceptance of infallibility belonging to the Church under such conditions. But for the present we are each committed to working out, under God, our salvation within our separate Christian families. As, more and more, we realise the limitations of these families, and their need to be joined together in the protection and mutual encouragement of one society under the headship of Christ, we realise the extent of the sacrifice which faithful membership of one particular family must entail. We may realise that the limitations imposed on us within our own family are too great to be compatible with the service of Christ, and we are free always to choose another set of limitations and another choice of opportunities of continuing in Christ's service. But realism is the chief requirement: and by fretting at our real limitations, but still remaining obedient to them, we may not only hope for, but live in the truth.

On Being Low Church

Peter Morgan

To the outsider I sometimes think that the Church of England must look rather like a block of flats. Various families live there, some of whom are related. Others hardly know each other and prefer it to be that way. The only thing in common between the people in the basement and those in the attic is that they live under the same roof. Generally speaking, people seem to like living in the Church of England because it's comfortable and pleasant and although it has come down a little in the world it is still felt to be generally more desirable than other property. Some of the tenants think that their neighbours are undesirable and that the block would be a happier and cleaner place without them. They feel the people next door give the place a bad name and that they have altered its character. The Directors have the irritating habit of ignoring tenants' complaints about other tenants and worse still, don't seem to mind who lives in the block at all.

It is certainly true that being a strong party Evangelical in the Church of England today means that you become an isolationist. Like the Shunammite woman, you dwell among your own people. Evangelical ordinands go to an Evangelical Theological College and serve their title in a recognised Evangelical parish. When they become Incumbents, it is to one of the hundreds of livings administered by the Evangelical Trusts that they go. Their contact with other schools of thought in the Church is minimal. So the parody of self-contained flats is not so wide of the mark.

This separatism is deplorable, but before anything can be done about ending it, it needs to be thoroughly understood. In "flat life" one often hears about animosities and suspicions between people who strike you as being too good and intelligent for that sort of thing. The reason for their estrangement often turns out to be some far-off event whose real significance has long since disappeared. Things were said and done at the time, barriers were erected, and neither side is prepared to be humble enough to seek a reconciliation. Surely this is exactly what has happened between the parties of the Church of England.

Whenever over the last hundred years a disagreeable decision or an unwelcome trend has been noticed in the Church, party protagonists have set up organisations and issued manifestos, constructing indestructible shelters and pill-boxes against the enemy. One very deep cause of our present troubles is that the people who

built the shelters and the pill-boxes built them to last for all time, and paid for them to be manned until the Parousia. The result is that today the loyal and earnest people who are manning these fortifications seem in many cases to be training their guns upon an enemy who has been gone for thirty years. An all too well-known example of this can be seen in the relations of the Student Christian Movement and the Inter-Varsity Fellowship. Merely because the Student Christian Movement fell into step with the prevailing liberalism of the theology of the first quarter of this century, it seems that the Movement must remain under a cloud for all time, however impeccable might be the orthodoxy of its leaders today.

It is this unreality and archaism, this harking back to old battles which many of us would like to see forgotten, that is the most disturbing feature of present-day Evangelicalism. Under this general heading, one must include an over-preoccupation with the subject of Canon Law Revision. Those who are most actively opposed to the revision of Canon Law do not object to remaining in a Church many of whose clergy wear eucharistic vestments because at the present time the wearing of such vestments is strictly illegal. If the present position were legalised they say that the character of the Church of England would be lost. They are openly suspicious and critical of the bishops, of the Convocations and the Church Assembly, whom they describe as not being representative of the whole Church. Rather do they regard Parliament as fulfilling this rôle. As the Reverend Thomas Hewitt, Secretary of the Church Society, recently wrote:

> "The Reformation was a movement of the laity and . . . . . the Prime Minister represents the laity".

Vigorous attempts are being made to reproduce something of the patriotic anti-Roman fervour of 1927 and 1928, but the Church Society has an uphill task. Many Evangelicals are becoming increasingly uneasy about the disproportionate amount of time which certain of their brethren are devoting to these legalistic and technical matters. They say that the time left to us may be short and that we should be much better employed in works of active evangelism.

The isolation of Evangelicalism in the Church of England today is not, however, entirely due to Protestant intransigence. It is, for example, a part of the official aim of diocesan Unions of Evangelical clergy to play a full part in the life of their Dioceses, and it is not only the preoccupation of some Evangelical clergy with battles long ago that makes the playing of this full part in diocesan life very difficult. A practical difficulty concerns the outworking of the movement for liturgical reform at the parochial level. The view that

a Family Communion service with simple vestments should be the central service of every Sunday is very widespread and seems to be held by most of the bishops. Those parishes which are happy to continue with the old 8, 11 and 6.30 pattern are often spoken of at best as behind the times, or else as being downright reactionary and obstinate. The fact remains that most Evangelical clergy are still quite happy with the 8, 11 and 6.30 pattern, not because they are behind the times but because they see no reason why Mattins should be displaced by a service with a far more limited appeal and with an infinitely more complicated musical arrangement than the simple well-loved chants normally associated with Morning Prayer. Because "Mattins" or "surplice and stole" (or scarf) parishes are in a decreasing minority the range of service which Evangelical clergy can give to a Diocese is becoming still more limited.

Ignorance about Evangelical beliefs and activities is far too widespread in the Church at large and those who think that Anglican Evangelicalism is waning are very wide of the mark. Evangelical Societies, particularly those working among young people in Schools and Universities have certainly "never had it so good", so much so that the President of the Islington Clerical Conference could publicly state that more than half the men ordained as priest or deacon in St. Paul's Cathedral at a recent ordination service were committed and declared Evangelicals.

The general tone of this article may seem critical and depressing. If it strikes that way, it is how one Evangelical sees the present situation. Limited contact and growing together between Catholics and Evangelicals there may be, but a vast amount remains to be done. The Church of England is not so wealthy in talent and vigour that she can afford permanently to rely upon the hard-worked "middle of the road" people who tend to sit on her Councils and set the pace in Church affairs. We need all that the Catholic wing of the Church can give by way of liturgical reform and a strong doctrine of the visible Church. Likewise do we need the energy, genuine piety and love for souls that Anglican Evangelicals are so well equipped to contribute to the main stream of Anglican life and thought.

*Unity in the Truth**

My native heath is Bossey and they call me Peaceful John;
I'm nuts on Life-is-meetings and such-like goings-on;
And I'll tell in simple language all about the cataclysm
That bust up our Society for Ecumenicism.

But first I would premise that it is clearly not a winner
For any friend of unity to cosh his fellow-sinner,
Or if he can't appreciate the other's point of view
To fell him to the ground with *Luthers Werke*, volume two.

Now nothing could be sweeter or more full of *agapè*
Than our inter-church discussion group on Christian Unity,
Until one fatal Tuesday afternoon when one and all
Decided to discuss the consequences of the Fall.

We started with an Anglican of modernistic bent,
Who argued that the Fall was not a fall but an ascent
And what our jaundiced forefathers interpreted as vice
Was harmless relics of the ape and therefore rather nice.

Then up there rose a Calvinist, with manner most abrupt,
Asserting that the soul of man was totally corrupt
And that, for sheer depravity, of all the human race
His neighbour the Dominican had earned the highest place.

The latter then retorted that St. Thomas plainly said
The human soul was wounded but was not completely dead,
Though if evidence was needed for the Calvinistic view
He thought the Calvinist himself would pretty nearly do.

Now I claim it is not etiquette and far beyond a joke
To use sarcastic language to another Christian bloke;
But neither should the latter give his injured feelings vent
By throwing learned treatises to any great extent.

An anxious German Lutheran then tried to intervene,
To bring some show of order to the animated scene.
He shouted "Simul justus et pecca—!", but, stricken dumb,
Collapsed because the *Institutes* had landed on his thumb.

* An echo of "The Society upon the Stanislaus".

And every Christian gent, upon my solemn word of trust,
Was hurling heavy folios and shouting fit to bust.
The way the Thomist orbited the *Summa* was a treat;
It brained the hapless Lutheran and laid him at his feet.

And this is all I have to tell about these goings-on,
For my native heath is Bossey and they call me Peaceful John;
And I've told in simple language all about the cataclysm
That bust up our Society for Ecumenicism.

E. L. Mascall

Comment

Later in this issue Nicholas Mosley quotes the Lambeth Conference's phrase,

> "The *means* of family planning are in large measure matters of clinical and aesthetic choice".

He adds that these two adjectives release the bishops from the need to say anything else. What exactly *are* we to understand by "clinical" and "aesthetic" in this context? Let us hazard a guess. Most well-known methods of contraception are embarrassing and absurd; they lower the *aesthetic* tone of the whole love-making process; further, insofar as they vitiate the climax of the sexual act they are *clinically* undesirable. Is this what the phrase means? If not, what were they thinking about as they talked away in Lambeth palace two years ago? They either meant something explicit and biological, something which we can compare with our own experience, or they meant nothing. The vagueness of love-making terminology is inevitable in our society but it does make the communication of sexual understanding almost impossible. If the argument within the church about family planning, overpopulation and catholic morals is to go any further it is necessary for some new Kinsey to ask the bishops, priests and laymen who are doing the talking, what their own experience is; not to put it too crudely, what they do when they're in bed with their wives. It is only when we have an explicit and professionally conducted statistical enquiry into the contraceptive practices of churchpeople that we can instruct ourselves and the rest of the world on questions of sexual morality. As with the Kinsey report, some surprising and unwelcome facts may emerge. But until we have done this we must not be surprised if the world does not take our views seriously.

At the College of the Resurrection an excellent experimental Liturgy is sung once a fortnight. Experimental is perhaps too strong a word, since most of the prayer book Communion Service is retained, though re-arranged and many of the re-arrangements, such as the dividing of the Prayer for the Church and incorporation of the prayer of oblation into the Eucharistic prayer, are well known. The most moving experience is the congregation's saying of the prayer of humble access. This prayer seems to speak to God in a special, private almost infantile way, and said by the priest aloud (even though on behalf of the congregation who are also praying it) displays an odd disassociation from the liturgy proper; but it acquires new significance when prayed aloud by the whole congregation, and restores to the Mass that explicit offering of private and individual unworthiness which some experimenters seem set on eliminating altogether. One's only regret is that experiments such as these, following instruction by qualified liturgists, cannot quickly spread to all collegiate bodies and even to some parishes. No doubt they will when the present generation of Mirfield ordinands have their own parishes. Meanwhile in the overwhelming number of churches it is as if the liturgical movement had never been. Ignorance and conservatism are far deeper entrenched than one would realise from reading the pages of *Theology* or, for that matter, *Prism*. What we need, perhaps is not a lot more experimenters but a lot more mediators and interpreters of an agreed corpus of liturgical experiment to clergy and laity. If this is what members of the liturgical commission hope in due course to produce we ought to let them get on with the least possible distraction and discouragement.

* * * *

We assembled in a church hall, some eighty lay Readers out of a total of over 180 (although attendance was announced as obligatory). This was the annual meeting of the Readers' association and we were mostly sweating in three-piece serge suits. There was an industrial chemist, a surgeon, several grammar school headmasters and a young man about to be ordained and to work full-time in a factory. Most of us seem to have become Readers at the request of the local clergy; there appeared to be an aggressive minority (hear! hear!) who are sure that the office is an end in itself and that the ministry of the Word and the exclusive study of the bible are the only certain safeguards against unnamed but presumably Popish inroads. The bishop, a humble and intellectual man, was very polite to us; we are, after all, necessary to the working of the diocese, in which the sad and ageing parsons and a growing number of sequestrations testify to the dying of the countryside, while new housing estates are virtually non-churched. We keep, or help to keep, the engine running, and also produce some disposable income

which our duties earn for the diocese. We debated for half an hour whether to give £50 or £30 to the ordination candidates fund, and compromised on £40. Then we had a good, teetotal lunch followed by evensong, taken by a senior Reader. This was a bit like those awkward occasions at OCTU when you have to demonstrate to a class of your own competitors how you would mount a platoon attack. All your temporary inferiors think, no doubt rightly, that they could do it better. The sermon was quite good but quite irrelevant. The bishop gave us his good wishes and some of us longed to talk to him and tell him we were on his side. But there was no time.

In all talking about new patterns of ministry the present rôle of lay reader is frequently ignored, and this is for two reasons: (1) because amongst Readers there is a very strong fundamentalist conviction that the office is indeed an end in itself, and that very few people could hope for a vocation to any other office unless it was to the present-style parochial ministry. (2) Some of those bent on reforming our present manpower are apt to identify all Readers with the one in their mind's eye—the elderly man, obstinate, powerful, stupid and dangerous in his effect on local church-life who for lack of means or brains or both failed to become a clergyman and spends his days taking his disappointment out on his surroundings. So while some Readers maintain that their office is the end of the road, reformers don't really want lay Readers amongst their candidates for non-parochial ministers, but look for a different type of man—one who has perhaps never given much to his local church (from which he may well be alienated by its dim smugness) but who would go for the high jump, if it were offered, while disdaining the low jump. There is truth in these points of view. But Readers as a body are more diverse in talents and intentions than their ecclesiastical image suggests, and a sociological analysis of their ranks would be of the utmost value to all those who think like the bishop of Southwell. Amongst the 5,500 Readers of the church of England are to be numbered the most likely of the supplementary priests of the future.

* * * *

In the last few weeks we have had news of two priest-workmen. Tony Williamson, who we hope will be writing in *Prism*, is now a deacon-tractor-driver with no parochial responsibility. The announcement of his ordination and the consequent publicity have obscured the fact that he is not simply working "in the world" as they say, but has a vocation to working industrial life with which his ecclesiastical preparation has had little to do. Less fortunate at the moment is the plight of John Strong, the vicar of Harlington who also works full-time in a Luton factory. He too has a vocation to poverty in the sense of low-status non-affluence, but round him opposition has grown to a point where he may have to leave. No

doubt personality problems are involved, but underlying these is the prejudice about having a full-time parish priest who is also a near-gentleman of leisure. The fact that he has as many services as, and a bigger congregation than before his arrival is regarded as irrelevant. Trivial complaints and individual maliciousness build up into a major row. This does not mean that our church rejects priest-workmen, but it does mean that a man whose path lies in this direction has in some way to suffer in his own person the whole separation of the visible church from its Master. All we, who are not thus called, can do is to try to take a small part of the burden on ourselves, for this is the way Christ taught.

* * * *

One of the best things about getting the three Russian monks on television was that they were able to meet Tony Williamson's father, Jo Williamson of Dock Street, who was on the same programme. They had met comparatively few of the parochial clergy and they could hardly have met a better one. Fr. Williamson and Fr. Bartholomew greeted each other with the greatest warmth and when the monks learned of his work amongst Stepney prostitutes Fr. Bartholomew said "God help you!" He added to one of his many chauffeurs later that though we would of course both meet after this "terrestial" life (his word) he very much hoped we could come and see him in *this* life in his monastery at Zagorsk. The three of them were so much younger than one realised (the oldest was 33) that their achievement in standing up to the current press persecution of their church is all the more remarkable. There are many monastries (69) and many believers (five million) in Russia, but this should not obscure the fact that certain elements in the Soviet government which from time to time gain the ascendant, wish Christians ill and take every opportunity of attacking them. The standpoint of such men as Fr. Philaret and Fr. Nikodim is straightforward. As Soviet citizens they are patriotic and obedient; in church matters they are autonomous and when attacked, hit back vigorously. Their existence, and their strength at the present time is rather like a miracle. Of all our communities they said they found themselves most at home at Nashdom (though at that time they had not been to Mirfield). The other communities with their teaching, missions and social work seemed to them interesting, instructive, but not quite the real thing. But if they return in 20 years they may find many other small communities with the same spiritual intensity as Nashdom (though perhaps without the same ceremonial) and will have even greater cause for gladness. For it is because in our church the monastic life flourishes and deepens in quality that the Russians hope for closer identification. The religious life is not, for the Russians, as it is for the Lambeth fathers,

something that requires no more than a discreet pat on the back once a decade; it is the very heart of religion.

* * * *

The remarkable thing about Dr. Johnson's dog was that it could stand up on its hind legs and talk. The quality of its conversation Dr. Johnson properly held to be secondary. Similarly with religious pop songs, one tends to be so glad that they exist at all that one doesn't enquire too deeply into their musicality. But now *Rhythm in Religion* has just been published—eight pop songs, four by Geoffrey Beaumont, the others by three other clergymen including one Diocesan Director of education. And the best of luck to all of them. Fr. Beaumont's though all based on the same limited harmonic scheme, are the best, and his words have genuine originality—"I am the Great I am", for instance, or this (we gladly excuse the triple mixed metaphor in lines 3-4)

> Prayer is the soul's sincere desire
> Uttered or unexpressed
> The motion of a hidden fire
> That trembles in the breast.

The period flavour of all these songs is 1939, the last of the virgin years, the year we still sang the songs from *Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs*. But in pop writing the greatest thing since the war has been the influx of high-level American musicals and the re-establishment of the folk-song idiom. And here seems a much more interesting vein to explore religiously than all this *Roll out the Barrel* stuff. Perhaps Fr. Beaumont at Mirfield might like to increase his harmonic range and take in some good Yorkshire dialect songs.

* * * *

A NEW MOVEMENT IN THE THE UNIVERSITIES. *A correspondent writes:* Recently our working committee has had a meeting with the Bishop of Peterborough to put forward the ideals of the proposed Anglican Student Federation. During these deliberations the form and aims of the Federation were clarified and a joint statement was produced explaining the way in which it is hoped that the Federation will function in all three sections; that is, in the Universities, pre-universities, and graduate sections. This discussion emphasised to the committee the vital importance of the graduate section and at the suggestion of the Bishop it got in touch with the Church of England Adult Education Committee.

Two meetings were arranged with the Secretary, Harold Wilson, in order to discover how the graduate section could fit in with and strengthen the work of the Training of the Laity Group. As a

result of these discussions the committee feel even more satisfied that the Federation must come to fruition and that it will provide an impetus in the awakening of the laity to their responsibilities in the Church.

A preliminary meeting has been held with Fr. Derry of the William Temple Association with encouraging results. The Chaplains Advisory Group has discussed the proposals put forward by the working committee and as a result the Federation will be on the agenda at the Universities Chaplains Conference in September. The Manchester Anglican Group has produced and circulated widely an intercession card asking for prayers for all the Universities and their Chaplains.

So far all the reactions have been encouraging and the committee hope to be able to take further steps in the next few weeks, culminating, we hope, in the actual launching of the Federation in January, 1961.

* * * *

TAKEN AT THE FLOOD. *Another correspondent writes:* Dust carts have gone, with Dolittle, the way of golden lads and lassies. Now we have Refuse Disposal Units. And the girl behind the counter in Lyons Tea Shop, the one that twiddles the tea pots on that ingenious contraption, is no longer a waitress but a beverage pourer. *Verbal elephantitis*, a strain of the virus *Superbia Vitae*, has done for the office boy (Junior Executive) the living room ("And this is the lounge") and almsgiving (Christian Stewardship). The main symptom of this disease, as of the more virulent disorder, *Keeping up with the Jones* is the compulsion to magnify and camouflage common activities. "My husband's job takes him about such a lot" can mean that my husband is a burglar, an ambassador, a ship's cook, and even that he travels in nylon stockings. The victim does not lie, he hints only at mysterious importance, and the saddest thing about his sickness is that it blinds him to the real importance of ordinary life.

The Church itself suffers from this disease. A clergyman who wants to get on will not alter the services, or have difficulties in the parish. He will *experiment with the living liturgy*, and *meet the challenge of the world*. And I have just been reading a review of missionary work from which it is uncommonly difficult to discover from the author's talk of ships, and spates, and embryos and "congeries of educational problems", exactly what the missionaries are doing. The work is called *Taken at the Flood*. For this reason:

> "(The present) is a moment when world events sweep forward in a vast tidal wave. A moment, unquestionably, of the sort of 'tide in the affairs of men, which *taken at the flood* leads on to fortune' . . . .".

This tide flows on through the book. It turns in medical missions, in Africa it is "a dam-bursting spate of angry waters", in Okayama it flows out "through widening channels and new opportunities". The Ship of the Church is to sail "on the great tide of the twentieth century", which, heaven help us, is not only a tide but an "apocalyptic day", a "unique moment", a "hinge moment in history". And while we are sailing the seas and opening the door on its hinge, "the soul of man is racing out to the frontiers". But I ask where is the ship supposed to be going? What frontiers? Or to be short, what are the missionaries doing?

The Missionary Society (S.P.G.) are taking "Urgency and Immensity" as the "key note of a momentous decision". I take it this means something big must be done at once. But what? The author enlivens us with some reflections on the vagueness of the Church of England, and its beautiful conformity to the mind of God ("At the present time the Anglican Church is the nearest expression of what God wants His Church to be"). And, with the aid of a splendid specimen of Dr. Fisher's ecumenical ambiguity (no one can quite come up to the Archbishop in foxing the issue), he discourses on the Catholicity both of the Church in South India, and the S.P.G. He also tells us that "The Church is involved in Africa" that "India is the land of religions" and that prayer "must issue in action". From time to time, lest the intellectual burden of his writing should weigh us down he stops to give us a breather. "Are you getting figure dizzy? We sympathise." "Has this chapter left you feeling giddy?" "Let us get some basic facts clear". When we get down to details of the journey the way looks uncommonly familiar.

But we cannot be kept entirely from what the missionary does. We find, for instance, that at Lebombo (where "the tide has turned, though it's a long way from the flood") diocesan boundaries have been readjusted, there is a new Bishop, and some ordinands in a theological College:

> "The present Bishop . . . can salvage it (the Theological College) if only he may be given the money and (still more imperative) the personnel who will face up to the peculiar difficulties here."

This is from a correspondent of S.P.G. The author of *Taken at the Flood* thinks it will make more impact if it is translated into American:

> " 'Churches are not tooled up with sufficient finances and personnel to meet the challenges of rapid social change,' said Dr. Robert G. Nelson of Indianapolis. 'Give us the tools and we'll finish the job' was the call of our war-time leader."

I do not know what Winston Churchill, or the sounding nothings of Dr. Robert G. Nelson have to do with the simple fact that the Bishop of Lebombo needs money and men prepared to work in

local conditions to run his theological College. And if the reader has the patience to wade through the froth this is the plain tale of the mission field. There is a want of men and of money, but in spite of this the gospel is preached, and the children of Christ are ministered to. There is no need for all this verbal fussification about so important a work. The missionaries could learn from an unbelieving poet:

> "Common as light is love
> And its familiar voice wearies not ever."

Its *familiar* voice—the familiar subject matter here demands a familiar style. There is hard work, prayer and love—the commonest and yet the most important things in the preaching of the Gospel. We do not find that the author of the *Acts of the Apostles* needs to go on about "hinge moments", and "the urgency and immensity" of the Church's task. There are some things and Missionary work is one of them, which deserve the dignity of common speech. Could S.P.G., I wonder, see its way to using plain English next year?

Down Protestant Hackles

William Bush

Some months ago Valerie Pitt remarked in *Prism:*

> "The curse of it is that the one devotion which would be useful, the use, that is, of the rosary, rouses every Protestant hackle in the nation."

Later David Winter, editor of *Crusade*, duly fulfilled Miss Pitt's prophecy and, his Protestant hackles roused, posed a serious question for those of us who contribute to *Prism:* do we offend other Anglicans of goodwill by taking certain things for granted?

I have chosen to accept Mr. Winter's criticism as justified and wish to calm his—and others'—Protestant hackles on an issue which seemed paramount in his letter: devotion to the Mother of God. (Mr. Winter has stated:

> "If there is one facet of the Roman Church which is more misleading than any, it is surely the cult of the Virgin.")

First one should recall that the Roman Church has no peculiar monopoly upon this devotion: it is as much a part of Orthodox Christian devotion as it is of Roman Catholicism. This is a fact we must accept as a beginning: devotion to the Mother of God *IS:* it exists both in eastern and western Christianity; in order to escape it one must cut oneself off from the two most venerable strongholds of the Christian faith in the modern world. This fact alone should reassure him with roused hackles that the Anglican who lights a candle, or prostrates himself, before an image of the Mother of God is not all hot for, or from, Rome. Rather he is merely reaching out towards a Christian tradition much more venerable in experience and sanctity than any of the "purifications" of this tradition which became particularly prevalent in the west in the 16th century.

For him unfamiliar with the Orthodox position a trip to Orthodox vespers might be enlightening. The western austerity of a straightforward singing of the Magnificat with incense gives way to an actual verse of praise to the Mother of God between each verse of her Magnificat, proclaiming her higher than the cherubim and more glorious than the seraphim, assuring her further that we, the believing Christians, do "magnify" her for this position. Again, the long Akathist hymn to the "Bride unwed", sung during Lent, recalling the protection of Byzantium by the Mother of God, is so florid that it shocks even the most devoted westerner whose participation in the cult of the Virgin has been limited to Roman Catholic texts. In an Orthodox parish there is, in addition to the possible existence of one or more particular shrines to the Virgin and Divine Child in the church itself, the ever-present ikon of the Mother of God on the left side of the altar; many times she again is present with the Archangel Gabriel on the holy doors since Orthodox Christians recognize in the Annunciation the very gate to Paradise. Hence, albeit that one may reject, with good reason, devotion to the Mother of our Lord and God, Jesus Christ, because it is not based on Holy Scripture, one's reasons are not so good if it is rejected on grounds of mere Protestantism since, I believe, the term "Protestant" has to do with practices peculiar to Rome and unknown to the undivided Church.

Holy Scripture, with the possible exception of Revelation, is neutral on the subject and one may well argue that our Lord showed neither Orthodox nor Catholic piety for His mother, according to the records. Here is a dilemma. One recognises the position of both Rome and Constantinople on this matter, and yet one feels scripturally that there is more to be said for the tortured spirituality of Augsburg than the twisted materiality of Geneva. However, there has always been some sort of *mild* Anglican devotion: the title "Blessed Virgin Mary" is retained in the Book of Common

Prayer and this "mild" devotion has, at moments, become quite ardent when expressed by the pens of Andrewes, Taylor, Donne and Hooker.

Now we come to prayer to the saints—including of course the chiefest of them. If one starts by invoking the Mother of God one will, of course, eventually invoke others; but what non-invokers inevitably ask is, "Why? Aren't requests better directed to God Himself?"

In writing "request" I do it consciously. I know that prayer will continue to be, in the mind of the average man, a request—indeed, even the Orthodox Jesus Prayer is a request for mercy. Should, therefore, one ask for a saint's help to obtain either grace or mercy? With all my fundamentalist background weighing heavily upon me I still answer, "Yes!" and my reasons for this "yes" are no more based on Holy Scripture than are my acceptance of special attire for the clergy or the manner in which Christians generally adorn their churches. All these things, including invocation of the saints, are natural. The person who goes against invocation of the saints denies himself a very great help—human help through the Holy Ghost—that comes not only from being one in Christ, but also from being *one in the Holy Ghost* who prays in us as in the saints to accomplish our sanctification, our unification in Him.

Perhaps the pragmatist will deny the possibility of contact between the living and the dead. But if we accept the destruction of death effected in us by Christ through the Holy Ghost, we know that we are living to God and to His creation after death as well as before it. Thus, our failure to recognise the *spirituality* of the issue of invocation is basic to our misunderstanding.

We might note in passing also that so-called "spiritualism" is actually materialistic since it tries, by material and visible means, to establish contact with the dead while the Church, holding all truth in her wisdom, knows it is *spiritually* that we participate with the dead; that the apparitions reported at Walsingham, Lourdes, la Salette and Fatima are spiritual visions and not the kind that, in séances, pat the spectator on the face.

Since we none of us can boast a very high sanctification-quotient, surely we should be in favour of any godly and sober means of arriving at holiness which has stood the test of Christian history. And let it be remembered that canonization is not really any more related to this than is an imprimatur: these two things merely make something official for the whole of the Church, proclaiming that what has been good for a part is now, officially, good for the whole. Hence, there is nothing more to hinder an Anglican from invoking a

favourite holy friend, long dead, than there is to stop Roman Catholics or Orthodox Christians from invoking a person not yet canonized.

I, who began my crusade as a fundamentalist, wish to assure all who seek friendship with the saints that this is a means to grace and a help to holiness. Why? Primarily because, as the psalmist so well knew, "With the holy thou shalt be holy". Hence, a healthy friendship with great souls who knew life of both the body and spirit and in whom, nonetheless, the Spirit of God prevailed, can be a powerful aid. For once one has caught sight of the holiness of a particular saint one's whole being is enlightened. Our understanding of the Holy Gospel which each saint, in his own way, incarnates, is a bit clearer.

Obviously there is a mystery in each saint as to how he in part incarnates the Gospel and it takes much effort on our part to get to know him well enough to achieve a sense of spiritual solidarity. (A trip to Lisieux was not enough for me: I had to read Thérèse's writings, think on them, experiment with her ideas in my own life and finally write on them before it all evolved into a firm friendship.)

This is particularly true of a relationship with the Mother of God. And although Mr. Winter may be no more ready to buy a rosary (there are of course Orthodox rosaries used by the monks for the recitation of the Jesus Prayer), he may recognise that even in the Holy Gospel there is a certain mystery revealed in the Mother of God accepting what God sent her ("be it unto me according to thy word") and that this mystery, penetrated by each of us through years of thinking about it with loving thoughts, may well help us to become something better than we are.

John Wilkinson, when he was at Oxford, was allowed by his college to have a Roman Catholic tutor in Theology as well as an Anglican; the results have been that the more Roman friends he has made, the more Anglican he has become. He has seen something of Continental Romanism, particularly at the Abbaye de St. Maurice et St. Maur at Clairvaux, and reckons that Reunion will not be practical till A.D. 2050.

But we are Protestants!

George Every, s.s.m.

The current number of the *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* contains an instructive account of Archbishop Davidson's unsuccessful attempt to persuade Mr. Asquith that the word "Protestant" should be dropped from the coronation oath in 1910, on the ground that this description of the Church of England was offensive to a great number of Anglicans. In view of the archbishop's known moderation, we may take it for granted that by that time the word was commonly regarded as partisan. But a hundred years earlier Archdeacon Daubeny, in his day the highest of High Churchmen, was the author of *The Protestant's Companion.* Not long before the Anglicans in the United States chose to be called Protestant Episcopalian.

I should ascribe the change to the co-existence between 1780 and 1830 of two movements that used the word in a specialised popular sense, that gave offence. The first was the political Protestantism that maintained a fanatical opposition to the claims of the Roman Catholics in Ireland and England to relief from the penalties of the penal laws. The second was the Evangelical revival. The two were contemporary but never closely connected. Many political Protestants were not Evangelicals, and some Evangelicals supported the political claims of the Roman Catholics. But all Evangelicals accused the rest of the Church of England, both High and Low (or as we should now say, "Broad") of insufficient Protestantism on the cardinal point of justification by faith.

There was nothing new in the objection that the English Reformation did not go far enough. But the Puritans claimed no more than that they represented the best, the most advanced, of the Reformed churches abroad. Luther to them was not a backslider, like Laud, for the Lutherans had never really arrived at the true Reformed position, whose inwardness the Church of England had failed to grasp. The Evangelicals attacked on a broader front, claiming that Archbishop Tillotson and the anonymous author of *The Whole Duty of Man* were alike in teaching a Popish doctrine of justification by works.

Against such charges there were two possible lines of defence. One was to contradict the Evangelical interpretation of the Reformation in general, and of Luther's theology in particular. But this would require a considerable knowledge of the history of the period. On the whole High Churchmen and Latitudinarians were

interested in other things, in the early Fathers, or in modern thought. The few High Churchmen who did turn their minds to Reformation questions, while they no doubt detected differences between the Reformers and modern Evangelicals, on the whole found the latter more tolerable than the former. Of the brilliant sons of William Wilberforce, the great Evangelical agitator against negro slavery, two became Roman Catholics, and one a High Church bishop. I do not think that any of them were ever ashamed of their father. And I have little doubt that Bishop Samuel, moderate and cautious as he was in his judgements of the Reformers, thought his own father vastly superior to Archbishop Cranmer, not only as a man, but as a theologian. It was easier to take the other line, that Cranmer was only one among many archbishops of Canterbury, and that the Reformation was only an episode, important but rather unfortunate, in the continuous history of the English church.

The disadvantage of this line was and is that it exposes the Anglican position to an immediate offensive from the side of Rome. If the English Reformation can only be very tentatively described as a good thing, and may even be accounted as on balance a disaster, then right was surely on the side of the recusants, who would have nothing to do with it, and is now on the side of the English Roman Catholics. It is significant that between 1836-7, when the leading High Church journal abandoned the defence of the Reformation, and the eighteen-fifties and sixties, a whole series of secessions to Rome took place, on a scale unparalleled before and after. I myself believe that these might well have extinguished the Oxford Movement in the Church of England, and perhaps the whole High Church party, if new developments in the sixties and seventies had not underlined the differences between Roman Catholic and Anglican approaches.

More important than the question of infallibility, which was raised for Roman Catholics by the definition of the Immaculate Conception in 1954 and the Syllabus of errors in 1864, and settled, at least for the time, by the definition of 1870, was the problem of the Church's attitude to the new science and to industrial civilisation as a whole. In the eighteen-sixties the spirit of the Syllabus, a spirit of uncompromising opposition, not only to Liberalism, but to the movement of the modern world, was very apparent among Anglican church parties. Men of zeal and ability such as Dr. Pusey and Lord Shaftesbury were as convinced as Pope Pius IX that revolutionary changes in the temper of men's minds and in their habits of life were fraught with spiritual danger, and that men and women must be told, in the name of God, to stop thinking thoughts that might lead so easily to the shipwreck of their faith. But while the Roman position of opposition to the spirit of historical criticism remained set, with minor undulations, for a great number of years, far indeed into

the present century, the Church of England, leaving aside pockets of resistance, changed her attitude with remarkable speed between 1860 and 1890.

The reasons for this are not easy to analyse, but they lie partly in the continued influence of Hooker and Butler on the ordinary Anglican ordinand. No one could study Hooker without acquiring a regard for laws of nature which are not observed only by theologians, or only by Christians. And no one could study Butler without respecting the method of induction and acquiring some sense that probability is the guide of life. The influence of Butler is strangely pervasive in the Victorian period, on Keble, on Gladstone, on Newman. Neither Hooker nor Butler could be regarded as representative figures for Protestantism as a whole, but any definition of Protestantism in England and America which excludes them must misrepresent the historical facts.

What is the real difference between the Lutheran and the English Reformation? It is that the first was a revolt against popular Catholicism, against justification by devotional practices, while the second began after the monasteries and the chantries had already been destroyed, and with them the main fabric of popular religion had fallen defenceless. The Reformation in England meant in the first place a new set of practices, vernacular worship in church and Bible reading at home, before there was anything in the way of preaching except in London and the immediate neighbourhood. It was the new pattern of church services which transformed the relationship between the nave and chancel in church, and between parson and parish, before the Puritans began to preach. And this is something that no returning tide of clericalism, Puritan, High Church, Evangelical, or Tractarian, has ever succeeded in reversing, this sense that the church belongs to everyone, not just to the parson. In fact it has become stronger in the Free Churches than in the Church of England, but it is a fruit of the English Reformation.

This may be only loosely related to justification by faith, and to the original protest of the princes supporting the Reformation, but I do not see why in an English context we should not call it Protestant. It has done much to make the English people what they are for good and evil, a folk who have been accustomed to pray in their own tongue, to read the Bible, and to do some of their own thinking.

A few years ago travelling in the Middle East in a Kelham habit, looking very like a Roman Catholic, I found people in Greece who deplored the growing differences between a Protestant and an Orthodox nation, implying that it was to Protestants that the Eastern churches would naturally look for protection against the power of Rome. I also discovered some, not only Orthodox and not

always Christians, who sensed at once a kind of difference between an Anglican and a Latin, and saw in the Anglican a kind of Protestant. Since then I have found it increasingly difficult to use the word in a sense that excludes Anglicans, or all Anglicans except Low Churchmen, and I should like to plead for a revival of the older usage that recognises the Church of England as Protestant, and a rallying-point for Protestants seeking a fuller Catholicism.

Questions and Answers:

Comments on the Ministry Conference at Keble, summoned by Nicholas Stacey.

John Porter

"It was worth the Conference Fee just to hear the Bishop of Woolwich's lecture."

What more than one delegate said was true. Not everything was up to the quality of the bishop, but we were left with a feeling that there is a great reservoir of dissatisfaction within the Church of England at the state of the ministry and the parochial situation which must soon break out or be channelled elsewhere.

That is why this conference was important—questions which have been bothering many clergy and ordinands for years as they worked in their isolated parochial situations were brought into the open: There were no revolutionary answers given, but at least the questions were faced.

The *raison d'être* of the Conference was given by John Morris, vicar of Longbridge and chairman of the Birmingham parochial reform group. He spoke of the basic concepts of the parochial system and of how these had broken down. Coupled with a shortage of clergy this meant that we had reached a stage when what we had should be placed to the best advantage. There was too much keeping an old machine going. John Morris began to ask the right questions—but the clue to seeking the right answers was given in the first main address to the conference, by the bishop of Woolwich.

Dr. Robinson spoke of the "Ministry of the Church" and he emphasised how the whole church shares in this ministry, a ministry

which is that of Christ as head. The Christian ministry was from above, administering the *episcope* of Christ, and within that ministry certain *orders*—of Bishops, Presbyters (this title was to be preferred to "Priests"), Deacons, and Laity had their reserved functions. The bishop showed how the Church in England was as deeply clericalist after the Reformation as it had been before. There was a need to consider whether the clergy *v.* laity issue had any real validity and whether the real distinction was not between *orders* of ministry.

In his address could be seen the beginnings of an idea which increased in significance as the conference developed—that of the growing importance of the rural deanery, which could be more than a mere administrative unit. It could be used as a small area group with some sort of unitary polity, or perhaps as a small sub-diocese with the exercise of some form of local episcopacy. His remarks on the ministry of women has a sort of heightened common sense, a recognition of the truth buried just under our noses, which bore the marks of prophecy.

Group discussions on various topics followed. The conference showed its concern with such topics as the laity, specialist ministries, supplementary priests, task forces, and incumbents. It was perhaps a pity that the reporting back of these committees showed an excess of hilarity; which belied the hard work put in at the discussions themselves. But it was at least refreshing to detect a change from the usual depressing stolidity of clergy gatherings, and afterwards a layman who has recently disposed of his business commitments as a prelude to ordination said how marvellous it was to find that there were some clergy who felt as he and many laity had done for years.

Canon Bernard Pawley gave us a brilliant burlesque of the present system. He showed how vested interests in the church were obstacles to reform. These were the parson's freehold, party trusts, and private patronage. If these issues were to be faced that of the Establishment could not be evaded, because management of church affairs and appointments would *have* to be in the hands of the church if these were to go or even be reformed. The basic strategic and tactical units of the church must be used to the best advantage. There was no doubt that the basic strategical unit was the diocese, but the tactical unit should be identified as far as possible with the local civil community. Thus it might be a whole town, or in the country just a small village, with a rejuvenated rural deanery as a meeting-place between the strategical and tactical units. His experience of such organisations in France showed how this could be done.

Chancellor Garth Moore, talking on the legal problems, assured

the conference that there were none, because all that was needed was a change in the law. But that was the real problem, because in any change there were three opponents : the people of England, who were convinced that the Church of England was going "high" and smelt Rome in every move, the Queen in the shape of the Home Office civil servants ("solid walls of sandbags"), and the Clergy of the Church of England.

The first need was to convert the clergy and persuade them that the freehold as it stood could safely be reformed, and this could best be done via the assistant clergy and the theological colleges. He had many pertinent remarks to make on the training of the clergy, and also on what could be done with redundant churches and redundant incumbents. The bishop needs greater power to refuse institutions, which at the moment is difficult for anything less than three convictions for rape! He should also have greater control over what is done in a parish, and, subject to safgeuards, an incumbent should be removeable on grounds other than crime or senility. So far as part-time priests were concerned, there was a need to decide exactly *why* we wanted them, and what they should do, and to see how the difficulties in the wording of the Ordinal could be overcome.

Discussion Groups on team ministries were followed by reports on what was happening, including stories of failure, in various parts of the country, and also in the Methodist church. It was clear from all the stories that authority was essential, even if as *primus inter pares*, that those going into a team should be willing to commit themselves for a substantial period of time ; and also those entering a team should go into the scheme with a definite undertaking to do so. The experience of the failure in Smethwick illustrated this last point. But the clearest testimony and the true voice of prophecy came from Stephen Verney, diocesan missioner in the Coventry diocese. He spoke of how many rural deaneries had become spiritual brotherhoods by regular meetings for prayer and Bible Study. "It's when we fuse together that the power of the Spirit is generated." Whereas much good sense and good humour pervaded the conference, he spoke of a spiritual experience which in its power and effect made much of what went before seem inadequate.

This was not just another gathering of angry young clergy, nor was it monochrome in Churchmanship. There was a notable absence of the lunatic fringes and the delegates ranged from an ex-member of the China Inland Mission to those from well-known Anglo-Catholic parishes. It was obvious that differences of Churchmanship would not be fundamental factors in team work. They would rather be complementary within the teams, as they are within Anglicanism itself.

Letters

TALKING RELIGION TO AGNOSTICS

Sir,

The apostles and Jesus himself—or rather John the Baptist and the prophets—seem to have begun the rot which Father Maycock laments (*Prism*, June); they surely were the first to perpetrate that "travesty of the Gospel" which he describes with such passion. We are told that the travesty consists in convincing people of their sin as a first step to their conversion to the gospel of Jesus Christ. In his great sermon after Pentecost St. Peter told his congregation that by wicked hands they had crucified the son of God; "when they heard this," we are informed, "they were pricked in their hearts", and asked what they should do. "Repent and be baptised, "was the reply ". . . for the remission of sins." "Repent and be converted," he declared in a later sermon; why? "that your sins may be blotted out." What had been the cry of John the Baptist? "Repent." What did Jesus say when he began to preach? "Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand." St. Paul wrote to the converted that he was glad, not merely that he had made them sorry by his letter, but that this sorrow had led to repentence. Yet, it is, Father Maycock tells us, a fallacy to believe that we must be penitent before we are forgiven. (Certainly we do not have to make ourselves lovable before God loves us, but this is a very different point.)

Father Maycock's letter proceeds, it seems to me, from the somewhat sloppy notions about God and his love, which are characteristic of our age. By concentrating on God's love in isolation we are liable to fall into a grandmotherly religion, which is very far removed from the gospel as preached in the New Testament. We need to emphasise the *holiness* of God—of which his love is an aspect—much more than we are accustomed to. We have today too poor a conception of God's holiness and purity and tend to treat sin as rather unimportant, at least I find myself falling into this error. The first thoughts of a person who claims to know God through Jesus Christ should not be how nice and loving he is; rather his sentiment should be that of the writer to the Hebrews: "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God." Our religion should certainly not be centred around man's sin—but this is often the place of contact between the evangelist and his potential convert. It is God's holiness, rather than simply his love, which must be the beginning. As we see a little of his holiness, we begin to appreciate something of our own sinful state and need of redemption; then we may understand God's love in redeeming mankind. We should never separate God's love from our need of that love, which is brought home to us in contemplating his holiness.

Father Maycock seems, by the tone of his letter, to dislike talk of

"fishing the convert" and "getting hold" of the outsider—but are we not to be "fishers of men"? No doubt all this will seem rather unsavoury to Monica Furlong. "I am *not* trying to convert you", she reassures her agnostic friends when that nasty unsociable subject of Christianity rears its ugly head at one of her tea parties.

Unless the Anglo-catholic movement returns to the spirit of such men as Dolling, Lowder and Stanton, it will deteriorate into an esoteric group of ceremonialists or a high and dry set of intellectualists. Many Anglo-catholics are said to be more interested in new churches than in new christians. The sooner we realise that the catholic faith must be evangelical (not merely evangelistic), and the sooner we recognise our duty of winning men for Christ (as many as we can, of course we are interested in numbers), the better it will be for the church. Instead of making smart remarks to our agnostic friends about the activities of CICCU over a glass of sherry, we might then appreciate the positive work these people are doing in converting men and women. We might perhaps be slower to criticise and quicker to understand and defend. We might talk less of those who have been driven away from Christianity by such organisations (how many of them would have become Christians under *our* influence?), and more of those who have been led to Christ by them. We might be less eager in condemning our brethren in Christ to amuse our friends in the pub.

The whole problem of apologetics is an important one, but, I should have thought, essentially different from that of preaching. To discover the rational foundation of our faith is one thing, to convince a person of its truth and relevance to himself, quite another. The causes of our belief are seldom coincident with our reasons for believing. We must certainly have a rationale of our beliefs, while at the same time remembering with Newman that "it is as absurd to argue men, as to torture them, into believing." The preacher and the apologist are both needed, and should be informed about the activities of the other; yet their aims and methods are fundamentally different. We want more of both.

Yours faithfully,

CAMBRIDGE. DAVID NICHOLLS.

CHANGING RÔLES?

Sirs,

One of the virtues of *Prism*, which makes it so refreshing to read every month is that, however cloistered or monkish its contributors may be, *Prism* is *editorially* unclerical. The unsigned editorial columns reflect different personalities—sometimes worldly, sometimes sophisticated, sometimes a bit simple, but all (or both?) blessedly unshuttered by the blinkers which get strapped round the clerical heads in the course of their training and ministry.

But this time, sirs, you have gone too far. *Comment* of July, 1960, is not written from the great Outer Circle of the Church but from some limbo in the remote distance in which the Church is no more than a hazy rumour and its nature and purposes unknown. So you are free to make the Church of the future in any image you like; and you recommend, for the "conurbation" (God save us) of 1970, a local bishop who has under him six or seven clergy, including:

a psychiatrist
a highly-qualified social worker
an experienced youth leader

(What are the other four? A doctor, a sanitary inspector, a schoolmaster, a geriatrician? A marriage counsellor, a stockbroker, an official of the R.S.P.C.A., a politician? A baby sitter, a fund-raiser, an adviser on the filling-in of forms, an organiser of outings?

While these six or seven are doing the real work of the Lord, the routine job of taking services, administering sacraments and preaching the word may safely be left, as part of "the detail", to *ordained laity*; these folk, not being full-time *clergy*, may perhaps have the time to "lay aside the study of the world and the flesh" which has now become the peculiar field of the *clergy*, and be "faithful dispensers of the word of God and of His Holy Sacraments".

Sirs, you have not thought the scheme out to the end; pursue it, and you have a really logical system in which the bishop and his clergy are not in holy orders at all and only the laity can be priests.

Yours faithfully,

TIMOTHY.

CHURCH HOUSE AND MORAL WELFARE

Dear Sir,

As Chairman of the Moral Welfare Workers Association, I write to comment upon the remarks made in your article on *Church House—Power Station or Repository* in the July *Prism*.

The reference to moral welfare workers as "field workers" (page 9) is inaccurate and misleading.

Since pioneer days when the church-worker was a devoted person giving all she had and contributing much through hard-gained experience, the training and employment of moral welfare workers has improved progressively.

The two courses of training are open only to carefully selected women and are adequately planned. The day has come when all training will be measured by a standard as visualized by the Younghusband Report. Many experienced workers have been accepted in statutory posts, for example Children's Workers, by virtue of ability and experience.

Is it in order to assist work such as suggested in your article that

many local authorities make monetary grants to maintain and extend the work being done? Is it for this type of work that two workers have recently been singled out in the Birthday Honours?

As representative of a large body of very "alive" and devoted workers I feel the remarks in your article should not pass without comment.

Yours truly,

M. A. V. RAYNES.

LONDON, S.E.14. *Chairman.*

(*Our contributor writes*: There is no incompatibility between the concern expressed in the letter from the Chairman of the Moral Welfare Workers' Association and the burden of the article to which she refers. The article in no way suggests that the many church workers, in the field of moral welfare and elsewhere, who labour so faithfully in the service of the Church and the community, are giving less than their best. We all know that they do, and the awards bestowed in the recent Birthday Honours list suggest that the community at large recognises this also.

But Miss Raynes and her colleagues know that this is not enough at the present time, and that quite a different criterion must be applied if the standards set by the Younghusband Report are to be met. For anyone who knows the way in which local authority social services have, until the recent past, like Topsy "just growed" without much rhyme or reason, the fact that many authorities have been relieved to subsidise an existing voluntary organisation to look after their unmarried mothers does not constitute an adequate criterion.

The questions which the article raises are firstly, whether it is appropriate for the Church, in the light of the developing sense of responsibility of the community as a whole, to try to retain under its control the executive responsibility for any part of the social services? And, secondly, if so, in which sector or sectors the Church's effort should be applied.

The answers to these questions depend largely on the nature of the task of the Church in society about which the article tries to say something. If the Church is seen as one of a number of contenders for control of the body politic, then it is bound to seek to maintain such footholds as it can in an increasingly secular world, and the redeployment of resources in accordance with the needs of the time looks like the surrender of strategic positions. If on the other hand the Church is seen as the community of the redeemed, set in God's world to be the instruments of his redemption, then it needs no foothold, because it knows the whole world to be God's footstool. Moreover it knows that only in the world and in, possibly anonymous, identification with it can it fulfil God's purposes at all. Thus it is free to operate without the considerations of prestige, which impede the effective work of worldly organisations.)

Books

THE POPULATION EXPLOSION AND CHRISTIAN RESPONSIBILITY by RICHARD M. FAGLEY.

Oxford University Press, 28s. 0d.

This book is about the enormous expansion of world population; the resulting food crisis; the possibilities of controlling the expansion; and the attitudes of the various religions and churches to the only one of these possibilities that might succeed—that of limiting families by birth control. The book quotes a great deal of statistics and opinions; but states its conclusions (it sets out to give a "Protestant" point of view as opposed to the Roman Catholic) as if they were self-evident from the situation rather than the result of theological argument.

Most churches are agreed on most points in this discussion. Man does have a duty to control the forces of nature and population; there are certain means he can use and certain that he can't. He can't murder, or sterilise, or abort; but can (obviously) practise continence. After all the mass of statistics and technicalities the border-line question boils down to whether certain married couples should be encouraged or discouraged by church authorities to use "mechanical" devices for contraception.

It is at this point that the Roman Catholics continue to argue theologically and the Protestants appeal to common sense. The argument has an unreal quality about it in which clinical and theological jargon get mixed so that one doesn't know if some Latin term is included because it was used by St. Thomas, or because it is indecent. One has sympathy with the Protestants who at this stage leave the decisions to the consciences of the married couples. The conclusions of this book are the same as those of the Lambeth Conference of 1958.

But the fact that the ultimate decisions should rest with persons should not prevent members of non-Roman Churches from stating their principles more clearly than they were stated at Lambeth or are here. The confusion arises because of this lack of distinction between principles and persons. It is assumed by Protestants that if the decisions are to be left to persons, then there is little to be said about principles; which is at least as great a fallacy as that of the Romans who say that because there are certain principles, the decisions cannot be left to persons.

What is vital in this question, as in many other border-line cases in which counsels of perfection mix with demands of expediency, is that the two should be separated; and that it should not be imagined that by leaving them separated there is contradiction. In this instance, there is no reason why it should not be stated unequivocally that in the "ideal" Christian marriage periodic continence would be preferred as a method of limiting children to mechanical contraception, but that this requires a state of discipline and understanding that many couples cannot all at once attain to.

The Lambeth Conference stated that,

> "The *means* of family planning are in large measure matters of clinical and aesthetic choice":

and the Bishops seemed to imagine that the use of these two adjectives absolved them from saying anything further. But it seems at least likely that continued use of mechanical contraception (beyond the point at which it is obviously expedient) may have harmful results not just "clinically and aesthetically" but with regard to personality and the marital relationship. Christians are called upon to *grow* in the Christian life: and one of the ways in which they may have to grow (because it is so fundamental to the relationship) is in the matter of contraception. A sensitive couple or a wise spiritual director would be able to tell this from the experience of the couple—a failing in the spiritual growth of a Christian marriage is discernible. But neither the couple nor the director can make much sense of this situation so long as mechanical contraception is completely ruled out on the one hand, and given the complete go-ahead on the other.

The true approach to the question lies in the realm of pastoral theology, whose terms are not black and white, but of the impossible but no less demanding struggle for perfection.

This attitude is relevant of course only to practising Christians. But the attitude of Christians to the way in which Governments handled the situation should be no less respectful. It is no use expecting non-Christians to make much use of Christian disciplines, any more than to enjoy some aspects of Christian marriage. The rôle of the Churches is to speak out if the moral health of a society is being corrupted, but not to resort to political lobbying to make their principles become law. Principles should be classified and advertised; but it is still up to governments (and Christians in the governments) to make the conscientious decisions. NICHOLAS MOSLEY.

THE MAKING OF THE CHURCH

by J. G. DAVIES.

Skeffington & Son, 21s. 0d.

This is a relentless book. It belongs to the "Seekers' Library", and Dr. Davies does not spare the "seeker". He wishes to know of the Church? Very well, he shall, but let him not suppose that he is being presented with yet another "little manual" of the kind which is published in such unnecessary numbers. Very acutely, the reader is made aware in the very first pages of the kind of agonised history which has been that of the Church, from within as well as from without. Heresies, schisms, nationalisms which the Church sought to suppress with the aid of the civil power—it is all here, including the singularly unlovely nature of much of the controversy. Psychologically, this is a very sound approach. For if the seeker gets as far as the end of the fourth chapter, he may yet, in spite of his wonder and possible disgust, have enough curiosity left to carry him through the author's excursions into the social life of the early Church. It is then hoped that he may begin then to ask the relevant questions as to what makes this unpromising worshipping community go on living at all. Then, and then only, does Dr. Davies deal with the inner life of the Church, and the faith by which it lives.

I have seldom seen so much information packed into so small a compass—yet it is never dull. There is no shouting, no tub-thumping, no tricks of oratory, no *argumentum ad hominem*. There is a calm, dispassionate account of the mainsprings of the Church's life and faith, with no punches pulled, but with none at all of the hysteria which often marks an appeal to the "seeker". The treatment of Christology is remarkably good, even though we might have heard more of the humanity-versus-divinity confrontation of Alexandria and Antioch. If I regret the absence of more than passing mention of the nationalism which often subsisted and upheld more than one heresy, then I have to balance against that the manifest gain of having the meaning of "redemption" in Irenaeus balanced against that of the Alexandrine Fathers. The doctrine of the Trinity is succinctly stated, and so are some of the difficulties of the contemporary terminology of the conciliar definitions. The treatment of the changes which took place in the New Testament understanding of resurrection (pp.194f) is more than valuable—it is a necessary corrective. All in all, the seeker to whom the book is addressed is more than fortunate. He could hardly have had a better mentor, and if he decides to pursue the bibliography he will have no room to complain that he has been ill-served. The book assumes that the seeker is doing what the term implies: the author is not addressing himself to the dilettante who is out to endorse the verdict of Gibbon on the Christian faith.

Two details: the quotation from 1 Peter on p. 114 (para. 3) makes the sense rather awkward at that point. And is not the origin of prayer at midnight and cock-crow to be found in the Psalter (p. 126)?

Since there is a fashion nowadays to display the names of designers of book-jackets, presumably there is some point in mentioning the phenomenon. Very well. The design of this jacket is post-neo-Coventry-Spence. Perhaps its suppression might reduce the cost of a very valuable book? C. S. MANN.